



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,221	07/18/2003	Martin O'Sullivan	50571/AW/W112	4670
23363	7590	08/13/2007	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			ROANE, AARON F	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			3739	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/13/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/622,221	O'SULLIVAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron Roane	3739	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,9-17,19 and 22-34 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 33 and 34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,9-17,19 and 22-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9-17, 19 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. (USPN 6,161,543) in view of Whayne et al. (USPN 6,203,525 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 2 and 17, Cox et al. disclose a catheter for ablating tissue via cryogenic or RF energy delivery, the catheter comprising an elongated generally-tubular catheter body (66 in figure 4 and its analogous counterparts in other embodiments) having proximal and distal ends; and an ablation assembly (distal portion of 66 including 70, see figure 4 and its analogous counterparts in other embodiments) at the distal end of the catheter body, the ablation assembly including a generally-straight ablation arrangement that is generally transverse to the catheter body (see figures 4, 6A-D, 24, 27, 28, 33, 34 and 45), the ablation arrangement comprising: a non-conductive tubing (distal tubing 89 in figures 7 and 8A-C and its analogous counterpart in other embodiments) mounted on-the distal end of the catheter, the non-conductive tubing has a pre-formed

generally heel-shaped curve comprising a first bend away from the axis of the catheter body and a second bend back toward and past the axis of the catheter body and terminates in a generally straight distal end which end is generally transverse to the axis of the catheter body. Although, Cox et al. fail to disclose that the ablation assembly is a porous electrode, Cox et al. do disclose the use of various alternative/equivalent ablation energy delivery forms/means including cryogenic and RF, see col. 3, lines 36-44. It should further be noted that Cox et al. disclose the generally straight distal end of the non-conductive tubing forms an angle with the axis of the catheter body ranging from about 75° to about 110° (see figures 4, 6A-D, 24, 27, 28, 33, 34 and 45). Whayne et al. disclose a catheter for ablating tissue and teach providing the device with a porous electrode assembly (362 in figure 36-39) mounted on non-conductive tubing (distal tubing 28 in figure 3A and its analogous counterpart 370 in the embodiment illustrated in figure 36), comprising a porous sleeve (364) mounted in surrounding relation to the one or more electrodes; and one or more irrigation openings (374) fluidly connecting the open space to a lumen (lumen of 370) extending through the catheter through which fluid can pass; wherein, in use, fluid passes through the lumen in the catheter, through the one or more irrigation openings, into the open space and through the porous sleeve, see col. 5, 6 and 21-23 and figures 1 and 36-39. Whayne et al. further disclose the one or more electrodes comprises a single coiled electrode (22/372) wrapped around a portion of the non-conductive tubing, see col. 5-8 and 23. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Cox et al.,

as taught by Whayne et al., to provide a porous electrode assembly located at the distal end of the catheter to serve as an RF ablation electrode in or to form lesions on the tissue.

Regarding claims 4 and 19, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, Whayne et al. further disclose the porous sleeve has proximal and distal ends that are bonded to the non-conductive tubing, see figure 38.

Regarding claim 6, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, Whayne et al. further disclose the generally straight porous electrode forms an angle with the axis of the catheter body ranging from about 75° to about 110°, see col. 5-23 and figures 1-39.

Regarding claims 9, 10, 22 and 23, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, Whayne et al. further the porous sleeve comprises a polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) that is expandable to no more than 10% at a distilled water flow rate of 30 to 40 cc/min, see col. 21 and 22.

Regarding claims 11 and 24, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, Whayne et al. further disclose the porous sleeve comprises a material selected from the group consisting of porous nylon, sintered ceramics, woven meshes and cellular foam, see col. 22, line 39-57.

Regarding claims 12, 13, 25 and 26, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, see col. 5-25 and particularly col. 23.

Regarding claims 14 and 27, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, Whayne et al. further disclose the electrode assembly further comprises one or more ring electrodes (the right electrode 372 in figures 37 and 38) mounted proximal and/or distal to the porous electrode (the left and center electrodes 372 in figures 37 and 38).

Regarding claims 15, 16, 28 and 29, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention, Whayne et al. further disclose the electrode assembly further comprises one or more temperature sensors (see for example 292 figure 29), wherein the one or more temperature sensors are mounted under the porous sleeve, see col. 23-25 and figure 29.

Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. (USPN 6,161,543) in view of Whayne et al. (USPN 6,203,525 B1) as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Fung et al. (USPN 6,120,476).

Regarding claims 30 and 31, Cox et al. in view of Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention except that a pre-shaped support wire made of nitinol extends through a second

lumen of the non-conductive tubing. Whayne et al. clearly discloses a first lumen (lumen of 370) used for irrigation, see col. 5, 6 and 21-23 and figures 1 and 36-38. Whayne et al. also disclose the use of a nitinol pre-shaped support wire (26) located in a lumen of a non-conductive tubing (28 and/or 28'). Finally, Whayne et al. clearly disclose an embodiment wherein the distal end of the support wire (26) is fixed within the non-conductive tubing (see portion 158 in figure 14), see col. 12 and figure 14. However, Whayne et al. do not disclose simultaneously disposing a nitinol pre-shaped support wire in one lumen of the non-conductive tubing and the having an irrigating pathway/passage in other separate lumen. Fung et al. disclose an irrigated tip-catheter that has at least two lumens and teach the provision of the non-conductive tubing (19) upon which electrodes (38) are placed with three lumens 30, 32 and 34, see col. 4-6 and figure 3. Additionally, Fung et al. teach the simultaneous provision of a pre-shaped nitinol wire (42) placed in one lumen (32) in order to provide steerability/deflection of the device and the use of another lumen (34) as an irrigation lumen in order to provide infusion, see col. 4-6 and figure 3. Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to modify the invention of Cox et al. Whayne et al., as taught by Fung et al., to simultaneously provide the pre-shaped nitinol wire placed in one lumen in order to provide steerability/deflection of the device and the use of another lumen as an irrigation lumen in order to provide infusion.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. (USPN 6,161,543) in view of Whayne et al. (USPN 6,203,525 B1) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Swanson et al. (USPN 5,961,513).

Regarding claim 32, Cox et al. Whayne et al. disclose the claimed invention except for reciting the one or more irrigation openings are located only on the side of the porous electrode that is to be in contact with tissue to be ablated. It is well known in the art to place or provide holes/pores of a porous material in a particular pattern and/or on a side of the otherwise porous material in order to achieve a particular ablation pattern. Swanson et al. disclose a tissue heating and/or ablating device and teach providing the expandable porous element (22) with holes/pores located on one side in order to achieve a particular ablation pattern and/or serve as a sensing surface, see col. 5-21 and figures 1-14. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Cox et al. Whayne et al., as is known in the art and taught by Swanson et al., to provide the expandable porous element with holes/pores located on one side in order to achieve a particular ablation pattern and/or serve as a sensing surface.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/1/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner will address each argument/remark in turn.

On page 8, 2nd paragraph, Applicant asserts that given of Cox et al. and the disclosure of the cryogenic modality, one of ordinary skill in the art would "not be motivated to replace the ablating end of Cox with a porous electrode arrangement, such as that described in Whayne," see page 8, 2nd paragraph, lines 7-9. Applicant contends this is so, even though Cox discloses other ablation modalities because the need for the hermetic seal to prevent fluid leakage. However, the hermetic seal is necessary only for the cryogenic modality. Applicant completely disregards the disclosure of Cox and its breadth and instead decides to focus on the hermetic seal. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Keller*, 642 F. 2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). In this regard, a conclusion of obviousness may be based on common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969).

Next, on page 8, last paragraph through page 9, 1st paragraph, Applicant refutes the rejection of claims 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Cox et al. (USPN 6,161,543) in view of Whayne et al. (USPN 6,203,525 B1) as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Fung et

Art Unit: 3739

al. (USPN 6,120,476). Applicant asserts that none of the prior art of record used to reject claim 30 disclose the support wire fixedly anchored in the non-conductive tubing. The examiner strongly disagrees as Whayne et al. clearly disclose the pull wire fixedly anchored in the non-conductive tubing (as shown in the rejection above) while Fung et al. is used to teach the subject matter of simultaneously disposing a nitinol pre-shaped support wire in one lumen of the non-conductive tubing and the having an irrigating pathway/passage in other separate lumen.

This action is made non-final.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Roane whose telephone number is (571) 272-4771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aaron Roane
August 2, 2007

A. R.

/Michael Peffley/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739